LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE MINUTES

SB72

Bill as Introduced

2021 SESSION

21-0884
10/08

SENATE BILL ***72-FN-A-LOCAL***

AN ACT relative to a state share of retirement system contributions by employers.

SPONSORS: Sen. Rosenwald, Dist 13; Sen. Whitley, Dist 15; Sen. Watters, Dist 4; Sen. D'Allesandro, Dist 20; Sen. Perkins Kwoka, Dist 21; Sen. Soucy, Dist 18; Sen. Prentiss, Dist 5; Sen. Kahn, Dist 10; Sen. Sherman, Dist 24; Rep. O'Brien, Hills. 36; Rep. Espitia, Hills. 31

COMMITTEE: Finance

ANALYSIS

This bill provides that the state shall pay 15 percent of contributions of retirement system employers other than the state for group I teachers and group II members.

- -

Explanation: Matter added to current law appears in ***bold italics.***
Matter removed from current law appears [~~in brackets and struckthrough.~~]
Matter which is either (a) all new or (b) repealed and reenacted appears in regular type.

21-0884
10/08

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

In the Year of Our Lord Two Thousand Twenty One

AN ACT relative to a state share of retirement system contributions by employers.

Be it Enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Court convened:

1 Short Title. This act may be known as the "Taxpayer Rescue Act of 2021."

2 Retirement System; Employer Contributions; State Share of Contributions. Amend RSA 100-A:16, II(b) and (c) to read as follows:

(b) The contributions of each employer for benefits under the retirement system on account of group II members shall consist of a percentage of the earnable compensation of its members to be known as the "normal contribution," and an additional amount to be known as the "accrued liability contribution;" provided that beginning with state fiscal year [~~2013~~] ***2022*** and for each state fiscal year thereafter, any employer [~~shall pay the full amount of such total contributions~~], ***other than the state, shall pay 85 percent of such total contributions, and 15 percent thereof shall be paid by the state; and provided further that, in case of group II members employed by the state, the state shall pay both normal and accrued liability contributions.*** The rate percent of such normal contribution, including contributions on behalf of group II members whose group II creditable service is in excess of 40 years, in each instance shall be fixed on the basis of the liabilities of the system with respect to the particular members of the various member classifications as shown by actuarial valuations, except as provided in subparagraph (i).

(c) The contributions of each employer for benefits under the retirement system on account of group I members shall consist of a percentage of the earnable compensation of its members to be known as the "normal contribution," and an additional amount to be known as the "accrued liability contribution;" provided that beginning with state fiscal year [~~2013~~] ***2022*** and for each state fiscal year thereafter, ***in the case of teachers,*** any employer [~~shall pay the full amount of such total contributions~~], ***other than the state, shall pay 85 percent of such total contributions, and 15 percent thereof shall be paid by the state; and provided further that, in case of teacher members employed by the state, the state shall pay both normal and accrued liability contributions.*** The rate percent of such normal contribution in each instance shall be fixed on the basis of the liabilities of the system with respect to the particular members of the various member classifications as shown by actuarial valuation, except as provided in subparagraph (i).

3 Repeal. RSA 100-A:16, II(c-1) relative to employer contributions for fiscal year 2012, is repealed.

4 Effective Date. This act shall take effect July 1, 2021.

LBA
21-0884
1/15/21

SB 72-FN-A-LOCAL- FISCAL NOTE
AS INTRODUCED

AN ACT relative to a state share of retirement system contributions by employers.

FISCAL IMPACT: **[X] State** **[X] County** **[X] Local** **[ ] None**

	Estimated Increase / (Decrease)			
STATE:	**FY 2021**	**FY 2022**	**FY 2023**	**FY 2024**
Appropriation	$0	$0	$0	$0
Revenue	$0	$0	$0	$0
Expenditures	$0	$53.0 million	$54.28 million	$55.60 million
Funding Source:	[X] General	[ ] Education	[ ] Highway	[ ] Other

POLITICAL SUBDVISIONS:

Revenue	$0	$0	$0	$0
Expenditures	$0	($53.00 million)	($54.28 million)	($55.60 million)

* The New Hampshire Retirement System states it is not able to separate the fiscal impact of this legislation between county and local government, therefore the fiscal impact is shown together as political subdivisions.

METHODOLOGY:

This bill requires the State to pay 15 percent of the normal and accrued liability contributions of political subdivision retirement system employers for group I teachers and group II (police and fire) members beginning in FY 2022. The remaining 85 percent will be paid by the political subdivision employers that pay 100 percent of such contributions under current law. The proposed change affects the pension contribution rate, but not the medical subsidy contribution rate. The bill does not impact the NHRS unfunded actuarial liability (UAAL) or funded ratio because it does not change the total amount of employer contributions due to the the retirement system, only the funding source. The New Hampshire Retirement System's (NHRS) contracted actuary conducted a supplemental actuarial valuation to estimate the impact of the bill. As detailed in the table below, state General Fund expenditures will increase and county and local expenditures will decrease. The actuary used projected payroll under the valuation assumptions and the adopted employer contribution rates for the 2022-2023 biennium for all impacted years (FY 2022-2024). Actual dollar amounts will be determined based on the June 30, 2021 actuarial valuation and may differ. NHRS is unable to break out the costs attributable to political subdivisions into the county and local shares.

Net Impact on Contributions in $ Millions Increase/(Decrease)				
	County & Local Employer Contribution			State
	Group I	Group II		
	Teachers	Police	Fire	
FY 2021	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00
FY 2022	(35.47)	(11.37)	(6.16)	53.00
FY 2023	(36.27)	(11.68)	(6.33)	54.28
FY 2024	(37.09)	(12.00)	(6.51)	55.60
Note: The estimates in the table above are based on calculations that do not include the medical benefit subsidy under RSA 100-A:52, 52-a, and 52-b because this bill does not impact said sections.				

AGENCIES CONTACTED:

New Hampshire Retirement System

Committee Minutes

SENATE CALENDAR NOTICE
Finance

Sen Gary Daniels, Chair
Sen John Reagan, Vice Chair
Sen Bob Giuda, Member
Sen Erin Hennessey, Member
Sen Chuck Morse, Member
Sen Lou D'Allesandro, Member
Sen Cindy Rosenwald, Member

Date: January 21, 2021

HEARINGS

Thursday		01/28/2021	
(Day)		(Date)	
Finance		REMOTE 000	9:00 a.m.
(Name of Committee)		(Place)	(Time)

9:00 a.m.	**SB 73-FN-A**	establishing a green building standards initiative as part of the low or moderate income housing loan program and making an appropriation therefor; and establishing a commission to study green housing and utility source options.
9:15 a.m.	**SB 82-FN-A**	relative to funding kindergarten adequate education grants and making an appropriation therefor.
9:30 a.m.	**SB 77-FN**	relative to fees for the services of sheriffs and deputy sheriffs.
9:45 a.m.	**SB 72-FN-A-LOCAL**	relative to a state share of retirement system contributions by employers.

Committee members will receive secure Zoom invitations via email.

Members of the public may attend using the following links:

1. Link to Zoom Webinar: https://www.zoom.us/j/91765533471
2. To listen via telephone: Dial(for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location): 1-301-715-8592, or 1-312-626-6799 or 1-929-205-6099, or 1-253-215-8782, or 1-346-248-7799, or 1-669-900-6833
3. Or iPhone one-tap: 13017158592,,91765533471# or 13126266799,,91765533471#
4. Webinar ID: 917 6553 3471
5. To view/listen to this hearing on YouTube, use this link: https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCjBZdtrjRnQdmg-2MPMiWrA
6. To sign in to speak, register your position on a bill and/or submit testimony, use this link: http://gencourt.state.nh.us/remotecommittee/senate.aspx

The following email will be monitored throughout the meeting by someone who can assist with and alert the committee to any technical issues: remotesenate@leg.state.nh.us or call (603-271-6931).

EXECUTIVE SESSION MAY FOLLOW

Sponsors:

SB 73-FN-A

Sen. Soucy	Sen. Watters	Sen. Perkins Kwoka	Sen. Cavanaugh
Rep. McWilliams			

SB 82-FN-A

Sen. Birdsell	Sen. Morse		

SB 77-FN

Sen. D'Allesandro	Sen. Watters	Sen. Bradley	

SB 72-FN-A-LOCAL

Sen. Rosenwald	Sen. Whitley	Sen. Watters	Sen. D'Allesandro
Sen. Perkins Kwoka	Sen. Soucy	Sen. Prentiss	Sen. Kahn
Sen. Sherman	Rep. O'Brien	Rep. Espitia	

Deb Martone 271-4980

Gary L. Daniels
Chairman

Senate Finance Committee

Deb Martone 271-4980

SB 72-FN-A-LOCAL, relative to a state share of retirement system contributions by employers.

Hearing Date: January 28, 2021

Members of the Committee Present: Senators Daniels, Reagan, Giuda, Hennessey, Morse, D'Allesandro and Rosenwald

Bill Analysis: This bill provides that the state shall pay 15 percent of contributions of retirement system employers other than the state for group I teachers and group II members.

Sponsors:

Sen. Rosenwald	Sen. Whitley	Sen. Watters
Sen. D'Allesandro	Sen. Perkins Kwoka	Sen. Soucy
Sen. Prentiss	Sen. Kahn	Sen. Sherman
Rep. O'Brien	Rep. Espitia	

Who supports the bill: Senators Watters, Whitley, Perkins Kwoka and Sherman; Representatives Telerski, Pedersen, Mangipudi, Klee, Schmidt, Dutzy, Nutting-Wong, King, Newman, Espitia and O'Brien; Curtis Lalonde; Sylvia Hartmann; Karen Gelineau; Mary Till; Judith Reed; Nikki Fordey; Robert Lehmenkuler; Joshua English; Brett Nelson; John Daly; Erin Stevens; Terri Donovan; Mitchell Wolper; Jane McDermott; David Dick; Amy Snow; Danielle Basora; Jason Weisbrot; Becky Benvenuti; Joan Hamblet; Laura Buono; Arthur Beaudry; Todd Selig; Donna Hanson; Lisa Drabik; Julia Griffin; Phillip Warren; Matthew Frye; David Cressman; Jeanne Beaudin; Kenneth Mertz; Brian Ryll; James Donchess; Jerry Frew; John Griffin; Scott Dunn; Barrett Christina.

Who opposes the bill: Jean Kimball; Dennis Corrigan; Neal Kurk.

Who is neutral on the bill: Marty Karlon; Jennifer Boucher.

Summary of testimony presented in support:

Senator Rosenwald, Prime Sponsor:

- This bill is the Taxpayer Rescue Act. It partially restores the state's contribution to employer costs for municipal employees.
- Decades ago when the state opened the pension to municipal employees, they were promised help to defray the costs as an enticement to join. For decades, the state did keep this promise with a small decrease during the Great Recession of 2009-2010.

- In 2011 the Legislature eliminated completely what was then 25 percent of the employer cost contribution for municipal employees.
- The cost didn't go away. It's had to be picked up ever since by property taxpayers who fund municipal budgets. For Nashua alone, that has cost over the past decade a total of more than $100 million.
- This is an unsustainable burden on property taxpayers that affects all of us, homeowners, renters and businesses. We all pay property taxes.
- In Nashua's budget for the next year, these homeowners, renters and businesses will be asked to pay more than an extra $10 million in property taxes.
- Senator Rosenwald is not asking the state to restore the original 35 percent, or even the 25 percent the state last paid in 2010. This bill would ask the state to share the burden of employer costs by restoring 15 percent of the payment responsibility.
- SB 72-FN-A-LOCAL comes at a cost to the state. But it is a cost that had previously been discussed and agreed upon for decades.
- If we say today that it is not sustainable for the state with its myriad of revenue sources, how can we possibly argue that it is sustainable for our cities and towns, with only the property tax as a revenue source?
- Our strong communities depend on our great teachers, police and firefighters. They help build the foundation for a strong New Hampshire.
- Let's do what is right and fair. Let's stop increasing municipal property taxes and share the burden with our local partners.

Nikki Fordey, Vice Chair, Litchfield Budget Committee:

- The retirement contributions have caused an exponential increase in property taxes. That level of growth is not sustainable. The town has experienced numerous conversations and made difficult decisions sacrificing needs for the town and its schools in order to not overburden the taxpayers.
- SB 72-FN-A-LOCAL is a step in the right direction. It's about doing what's right for the taxpayers. It is not a partisan issue.
- The increase in costs year-over-year or every two years for the Town of Litchfield has been in the 15-20 percent range. This forces the town to cut back on necessary services. People will continue to suffer.
- Senator Giuda asked Ms. Fordey to identify the source of the significant increases in the retirement fund contributions for Litchfield. Ms. Fordey indicated resources provided by the New Hampshire Municipal Association stated part of the funds go to investment opportunities. When the rate of return for the retirement system is not realized, the cities and towns must make up the difference. Senator Giuda inquired if the underlying driver for the cost of retirement benefits is the salaries paid by individual communities. Ms. Fordey agreed that would be one factor. Senator Giuda stressed it is driven by the wage scales that set the percentages of retirement contributions. He stated his small town is dealing with the very same issues. It may not be appropriate for the state to pick up the cost differential for communities that are paying wages that are significantly higher, perhaps, than they can afford. Ms. Fordey explained on the municipal side, her town has been fairly strict at keeping increases at less than 3 percent. Some of the wage scales are part of collective bargaining

agreements. They have attempted to keep those costs down. On the teachers' side in Litchfield, the increase in retirement contributions in one fiscal year exceeded $400,000. On the municipal side, if you are a town that has a tax cap, like Litchfield, it makes it even more difficult to make any kind of changes or respond to any growth in town when so much of that is taken up by an increase that has been shifted from the state down to the municipalities. Ms. Fordey agreed trying to get a handle on wages helps, but much more goes into it than what is within a budget committee's reach.

- Senator Rosenwald inquired if Litchfield were paying the same salaries today that it was paying 10 years ago when the state was paying 25 percent of the employer cost, would Litchfield still be paying 25 percent more today than it was paying 10 years ago? Ms. Fordey stated she does not believe so.

Becky Benvenuti, Government Finance Advisor, New Hampshire Municipal Association:

- Restoring the state's share of employer costs for police, teachers and firefighters has been a longstanding policy of NHMA.
- While most political subdivisions in New Hampshire also participate in the retirement system for their employee members, participation is mandatory under statute for police, fire and teacher members.
- The state's contribution, which was originally 40 percent in 1967 when joining the system before being reduced to 35 percent in 1977, was also mandatory. The legislation amending the statute in 2011 to eliminate completely the state's 35 percent share for police, fire and teacher employer costs, has had one of the largest fiscal impacts upon our municipalities in decades.
- In just the 8-year period from 2013 to 2020 the elimination of the state share has amounted to an increase in employer contribution costs required to be paid by political subdivisions of over $720 million.
- The retirement system's original $5.9 billion unfunded liability is amortized over a 30-year period ending in 2039. Of that amount, 80 percent is required to be paid through the employer contributions.
- Up until 2013 the state shared with political subdivisions the obligation to fully pay this longstanding liability. The elimination of the state's share of the employer costs has down shifted the state level of financial responsibility to the local taxpayers, whose municipal, county and local school property tax rates have all increased over the past 8 years, in order to help raise the property tax revenue necessary to fund this additional $729 million in municipal, school, school district and county employer costs, which are mandatory for police, firefighters and teachers.
- Although a 15 percent contribution, estimated to be $53 million in FY 2022 according to the fiscal note in the bill, would restore less than the state's original 35 percent share, estimated to be $123.62 million, SB 72-FN-A-LOCAL does provide significant and much needed relief to political subdivisions, and would help offset the major increase which becomes effective July 1.

James Donchess, Mayor, City of Nashua:

- These major increases in costs are not driven by any local wage increases. That has very little to do with this. If you talk with Mr. Karlon or Mr. Lagos at the

New Hampshire Retirement System, they will tell you 80 percent of the money we are paying in currently is to recapitalize, or build up the assets of the retirement system. Only 20 percent of the money the cities and towns are paying are related to covering the retirement benefits of employees who are currently working for the cities and towns.

- We are not complaining about increases in pension costs related to any raises given at the local level.
- In the 1990s and the twenty-first century prior to 2010, unwise decisions were made at the state level which caused the retirement system, the percentage of long-term liabilities that could be covered by the current assets of the system, for about $10 billion, to decline to approximately 60 percent. It used to be 100 percent funded, and as a result of these decisions made at the state level, it dropped to 60 percent funded. Since that time, there has been a legislative mandate to go to 100 percent funding. The only way to do that is to collect far, far more than what is required to pay for the pensions of current employees.
- Another decision made at the state level causing a big increase from the current year to next year was made by the New Hampshire Retirement System to reduce the assumed rate of return on the pension assets from 7.25 to 6.75. This means you need to have more money from the cities and towns to recapitalize the system.
- If the system were 100 percent funded, this change from 7.25 to 6.75 wouldn't be that significant. But because we are paying 5 times what is required to meet the costs for current employees, when you reduce the rate of return it has a very substantial affect on increasing the cost.
- This affects all cities and towns. Everyone has teachers, fire and police.
- Nashua's cost is going up $4.4 million unrelated to increases in wages. There is an increase of 2-3 percent based on wage increases; no problem. The increase related to the reduction in the assumed rate of return will cost Nashua $4.4 million.
- The cities and towns are a victim of two things. First, victims of a broken promise. Municipalities entered the state pension system decades ago based upon the inducement that the state would pay 40 percent of costs. Probably you wouldn't have the cities and towns in the state pension system had that promise not been made. The cities and towns are victims of mismanagement of the system.
- Municipalities need relief. This affects everyone. We cannot afford to be hit by these major increases right now. We need your help.

John Griffin, CFO, City of Nashua:

- The Board of Trustees for the New Hampshire Retirement System voted in June 2020 to reduce the retirement system's investment assumption, lowering the assumed rate of return from 7.25 percent to 6.75 percent. This is quite significant. Subsequent to this action, new employer rates for FY 2022 and FY 2023 were calculated. Applying the increased employer rates to the estimated NHRS pensionable payroll for the City of Nashua in FY 2022 results in an increase of approximately $4.4 million. This $4.4 million will increase the annual payments made by Nashua to NHRS to $29.3 million during FY 2022.

- This impact is significant for Nashua. For every $2 million that is added to the city's General Fund Operating Budget, a one percent increase is added to the tax rate. Therefore, the $4.4 million increase will raise the tax rate approximately 2 percent for this single cost item.
- The impact of adopting SB 72-FN-A-LOCAL, which has the state contributing 15 percent of the employer rates, will reduce Nashua's NHRS employer pension costs by approximately $3.7 million, providing much needed relief to Nashua taxpayers.
- Senator Daniels inquired if the fact that NHRS put out an expectation that you're going to get 6.75 percent return at a time when the Northeast CPI is 1.3 percent, does that exacerbate the problem? Mr. Griffin explained they've seen two relatively significant actions in the last four years. In 2018 the assumed rate of return was 7.75 percent. It was reduced to 7.25. Most recently 7.25 percent was reduced to 6.75 percent. NHRS has an investment team that invests billions of dollars in the funds. The actuaries and the money managers are comfortable with the 6.75 percent, even though the CPIU is slightly less than two percent on a 3-year rolling average.

Representative Michael O'Brien:

- Representative O'Brien is Vice President of Nashua's Board of Aldermen, and serves on the city's Budget Committee and Finance Committee. He is a proud, retired member of Nashua Fire and Rescue, having served 35 years. He now receives his benefits from the New Hampshire Retirement System.
- "Promises made, promises kept" is a very worthwhile statement. The goal of 1967 has not been maintained in 2020.
- It has cost the citizens of Nashua much money.
- The two percent increase in the tax rate for Nashua is for this one, single item.
- It hurts much needed services, can be used to "weaponize" what you want to pay your employees, and adds to the cost of living.
- Nashua compensates its qualified municipal employees accordingly.
- Nothing has been done to fix the retirement system.
- With this bill we are asking the state to pay its fair share.
- Every community is feeling this pinch,
- Please listen to the New Hampshire Municipal Association, your cities and towns.
- This is a hidden tax burden. If the state isn't paying it, someone is paying it.
- By referring this obligation back to the local communities, you have increased their tax burden to meet the needs of the pension system.

Summary of testimony presented in opposition:

Dennis Corrigan:

- Mr. Corrigan is a retired pension actuary, and worked in an insurance company setting the prices for their group pension clients. Later he worked in an actuarial consulting firm as a group pension consultant to 25 clients with responsibility for installation, amendment and statutory valuation of pension plans. Mr. Corrigan served on the New Hampshire Decennial Retirement

Commission as a public expert member in 2017. This group studied the NH Retirement System and recommended legislative changes.

- There are important public policy reasons that pension plan sponsors should not be subsidized by outside entities.
- If this bill were enacted as drafted, the economic costs of pensions for employees of the town of Pittsfield would partially be borne by taxpayers of the city of Concord, via subsidy to the New Hampshire state budget and vice versa.
- Sound decisions on changes to the pension plans of towns and cities will be attenuated and diluted. The incentives to maintain appropriate benefit levels will be reduced. The incentives to boost benefits to unreasonable levels will be augmented.
- At first no change in total New Hampshire-wide system costs will occur. But over time, local politicians will feel pressure to increase pension benefits in their towns because their taxpayers will pay less than the entirety of the costs. Their taxpayers are suffering from paying part of the increase in costs enacted in other towns.
- In the future it will be much harder for the Legislature to resist calls to increase the share borne by the state from 15 percent to a higher percentage, than it is to resist this call to increase it from zero to 15 percent.

Neal Kurk, Board Member, Granite State Taxpayers:

- For almost six decades the state has reduced the share of municipal contributions from 40 percent to zero. That was done for two reasons. One obvious reason was to balance the state budget. To the extent we don't have to make these payments, there's more money to spend on other state services. The more important reason was to ensure the municipalities were responsible for the full cost of their decisions; in this case, hiring employees.
- Today it is imprudent to add a very expensive new program in tight financial times. This program would cost over $100 million in the new budget, on top of a projected deficit of similar size in the current budget.
- The intention is to reduce local employers' costs to participate in the retirement system. However, whether the reduced costs to municipalities would translate into lower property taxes, or larger local budgets, is unknown.
- This is an effort to transfer the tax burden from local property taxpayers to state taxpayers, such as payers of the interest and dividends tax and payers of business taxes. Or to force a reduction through the budget in state services.
- This is imprudent at this time, and as a matter of policy and principle, it is undesirable for the state to subsidize municipalities in this way.

Neutral Information Presented:

Marty Karlon, New Hampshire Retirement System:

- The New Hampshire Retirement System does not take a position on this bill. Mr. Karlon submitted a written briefing on the fiscal note of the bill, and provided background on the history of the state contribution towards local teachers, police and fire costs over the prior decades.

- This bill would not change the employer contribution rates for NHRS, or have any actuarial impact. They would simply be receiving some of the contributions from the state that would otherwise be paid for by the cities and towns.
- Senator Daniels inquired if cities and towns are required to use the New Hampshire Retirement System. Mr. Karlon explained membership is mandatory for full-time teacher, police and fire members. Communities do have the option to participate for their employees or not. Once the decision is made, it's rather difficult to move away from.

dm
Date Hearing Report completed: February 1, 2021

SENATE CALENDAR NOTICE
Finance

Sen Gary Daniels, Chair
Sen John Reagan, Vice Chair
Sen Bob Giuda, Member
Sen Erin Hennessey, Member
Sen Chuck Morse, Member
Sen Lou D'Allesandro, Member
Sen Cindy Rosenwald, Member

Date: March 3, 2021

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Tuesday		03/16/2021
(Day)		(Date)
Finance	REMOTE 000	1:00 p.m.
(Name of Committee)	(Place)	(Time)

1:00 p.m. EXECUTIVE SESSION ON PENDING LEGISLATION

Committee members will receive secure Zoom invitations via email.
Members of the public may attend using the following links:
1. To join the webinar: https://www.zoom.us/j/93064180322
2. Or Telephone: Dial (for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location): 1-301-715-8592, or 1-312-626-6799, or 1-929-205-6099, or 1-253-215-8782, or 1-346-248-7799, or 1-669-900-6833
3. Or iPhone one-tap: 13126266799,,93064180322# or 19292056099,,93064180322#
4. Webinar ID: 930 6418 0322
5. To view on YouTube, click here: https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCjBZdtrjRnQdmg-2MPMiWrA

The following email will be monitored throughout the meeting by someone who can assist with and alert the committee to any technical issues: remotesenate@leg.state.nh.us or call 603-271-6931.

Deb Martone 271-4980

Gary L. Daniels
Chairman

Speakers

SB 72 Sign-In Sheet

Name	Title	Representi	Position	Testifing
Benvenuti	A Lobbyist	New Hamp	Support	Yes
CORRIGAN	A Member	Myself	Oppose	Yes
kurk neal	A Member	Granite Sta	Oppose	Yes
Griffin Johr	State Agen	City of Nasl	Support	Yes
Donchess J	An Elected	Nashua	Support	Yes
O'Bri	An Elected	District 36	Support	Yes
Karlon Mar	State Agen	NH Retiren	Neutral	Yes
Fordey Nikl	An Elected	Litchfield N	Support	Yes
Lehmenkul	A Member	Myself	Support	No
Daly John	A Member	Myself	Support	No
Sherman S	An Elected	SD 24	Support	No
Gelineau K	A Member	Myself	Support	No
English Josl	A Member	Myself	Support	No
Nelson Bre	A Member	Myself	Support	No
Stevens Eri	A Member	Myself	Support	No
Donovan T	A Member	Myself	Support	No
Pauer Eric	A Member	Myself	Support	No
Watters Se	An Elected	Myself (SD	Support	No
Perkins Kw	An Elected	Myself (SD	Support	No
Lalonde Cu	A Member	Myself	Support	No
Hartmann !	A Member	Myself	Support	No
Till Mary	A Member	Myself	Support	No
Reed Judith	A Member	Myself	Support	No
Boucher Je	A Member	Town of Ha	Neutral	No
Dutzy Sher	An Elected	Myself	Support	No
Frew Jerry	A Lobbyist	NH School	Support	No
Dunn Scott	A Member	Town of Gi	Support	No
Mangipudi	An Elected	Hills 35	Support	No
Christina B	A Lobbyist	New Hamp	Support	No
Beaudin Je	A Member	Town of Be	Support	No
Mertz Kenr	An Elected	The Town (	Support	No
Espitia Mar	An Elected	Myself	Support	No
Ryll Brian	A Lobbyist	Professiona	Support	No

SB 72 Sign-In Sheet

Warren Phi	A Member	Myself	Support	No
Whitley Be	An Elected	Myself	Support	No
Buono Laui	A Member	Town of Hi	Support	No
Hanson Do	A Member	Myself	Support	No
Drabik Lisa	A Member	Town of Lo	Support	No
Griffin Julia	A Member	Town of Ha	Support	No
Hamblet Jo	A Member	Myself	Support	No
Beaudry Ar	A Member	NHSPFFRA	Support	No
Todd Selig	A Member	Town of Dı	Support	No
Frye Matth	An Elected	Northwooc	Support	No
Cressman I	A Member	Myself	Support	No
Wolper Mi	A Member	Myself	Support	No
Dick David	A Member	Myself	Support	No
Klee Patrici	An Elected	Myself	Support	No
McDermot	A Member	Myself	Support	No
Kimball Jea	A Member	Myself	Oppose	No
Telerski Lai	An Elected	Hillsboroug	Support	No
Newman S	An Elected	Myself	Support	No
Weisbrot Ja	A Member	Myself	Support	No
Pedersen N	An Elected	Hillsboroug	Support	No
Schmidt Jai	An Elected	Myself	Support	No
Nutting-W	An Elected	Myself	Support	No
Snow Amy	A Member	Myself	Support	No
King Mark	An Elected	Myself	Support	No
Basora Dar	State Agen	Town of Gc	Support	No

Voting Sheets

Senate Finance Committee

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Bill # SB 72-FN-A-L

Hearing date: 01/28/21

Executive session date: 03/16/21

Motion of: ITL **VOTE:** 5-2

	Made by	Seconded	Reported
Senator:	Daniels ☐	Daniels ☐	Daniels ☐
	Reagan ☐	by Senator: Reagan ☑	by Senator: Reagan ☐
	Giuda ☐	Giuda ☐	Giuda ☐
	Rosenwald ☐	Rosenwald ☐	Rosenwald ☐
	D'Allesandro ☐	D'Allesandro ☐	D'Allesandro ☐
	Morse ☐	Morse ☐	Morse ☐
	Hennessey ☑	Hennessey ☐	Hennessey ☐

Motion of: _____ **VOTE:** _____

	Made by	Seconded	Reported
Senator:	Daniels ☐	Daniels ☐	Daniels ☐
	Reagan ☐	by Senator: Reagan ☐	by Senator: Reagan ☐
	Giuda ☐	Giuda ☐	Giuda ☐
	Rosenwald ☐	Rosenwald ☐	Rosenwald ☐
	D'Allesandro ☐	D'Allesandro ☐	D'Allesandro ☐
	Morse ☐	Morse ☐	Morse ☐
	Hennessey ☐	Hennessey ☐	Hennessey ☐

Committee Member	*Present*	Yes	No	*Reported out by*
Senator Daniels , Chairman	☑	☑	☐	☑
Senator Reagan, Vice-Chair	☑	☑	☐	☐
Senator Giuda	☑	☑	☐	☐
Senator Hennessey	☑	☑	☐	☐
Senator Rosenwald	☑	☐	☑	☐
Senator Morse	☑	☑	☐	☐
Senator D'Allesandro	☑	☐	☑	☐

Amendments: _____

Notes: _____

Committee Report

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

SENATE

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE

Tuesday, March 16, 2021

THE COMMITTEE ON Finance

to which was referred **SB 72-FN-A-LOCAL**

AN ACT relative to a state share of retirement system contributions by employers.

Having considered the same, the committee recommends that the Bill

IS INEXPEDIENT TO LEGISLATE

BY A VOTE OF: 5-2

Senator Gary Daniels
For the Committee

Deb Martone 271-4980

General Court of New Hampshire - Bill Status System

Docket of SB72

Docket Abbreviations

Bill Title: relative to a state share of retirement system contributions by employers.

Official Docket of **SB72.**:

Date	Body	Description
1/19/2021	S	**Introduced** 01/06/2021 and Referred to Finance; **SJ 3**
1/21/2021	S	Remote **Hearing:** 01/28/2021, 09:45 am; Links to join the hearing can be found in the Senate Calendar; **SC 8**
3/16/2021	S	Committee Report: Inexpedient to Legislate, 03/25/2021; **SC 16**
3/25/2021	S	Sen. Daniels Moved Laid on Table, **RC** 24Y-0N, MA; 03/25/2021; **SJ 9**
3/25/2021	S	Pending Motion Inexpedient to Legislate; 03/25/2021; **SJ 9**

NH House	NH Senate

Other Referrals

Senate Inventory Checklist for Archives

Bill Number: SB 72-FN-A-L **Senate Committee:** FINANCE

Please include all documents in the order listed below and indicate the documents which have been included with an "X" beside

X Final docket found on Bill Status

Bill Hearing Documents: {Legislative Aides}

X Bill version as it came to the committee

X All Calendar Notices

X Hearing Sign-up sheet(s)

___ Prepared testimony, presentations, & other submissions handed in at the public hearing

X Hearing Report

___ Revised/Amended Fiscal Notes provided by the Senate Clerk's Office

Committee Action Documents: {Legislative Aides}

All amendments considered in committee (including those not adopted):

___ - amendment # _____ ___ - amendment # _____

___ - amendment # _____ ___ - amendment # _____

X Executive Session Sheet

X Committee Report

Floor Action Documents: {Clerk's Office}

All floor amendments considered by the body during session (only if they are offered to the senate):

___ - amendment # _____ ___ - amendment # _____

___ - amendment # _____ ___ - amendment # _____

Post Floor Action: (if applicable) {Clerk's Office}

___ Committee of Conference Report (if signed off by all members. Include any new language proposed by the committee of conference):

___ Enrolled Bill Amendment(s)

___ Governor's Veto Message

All available versions of the bill: {Clerk's Office}

___ as amended by the senate ___ as amended by the house

___ final version

Completed Committee Report File Delivered to the Senate Clerk's Office By:

Deb Martone 07/20/21

Committee Aide **Date**

Senate Clerk's Office _____